Restoration, Travel Management Implementation (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version # _____	APP # 700556

A. List of Restoration Activities

The Inyo National Forest completed a comprehensive Travel Management Analysis and decision in August of 2009, and is currently initiating a suite of treatments that will implement this decision. The 2009 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) outline an implementation strategy that will assist the public in utilizing the designated system of roads and trails, and avoid confusion about which routes are legal to use. A key element analyzed includes blocking and disguising the intersections/entrances of unauthorized (illegal) routes. This work, as analyzed and authorized in the FEIS/ROD, is described in the FEIS in Chapter 2, pgs 30-34. These pertinent pages are attached to this request, but the complete analysis documents and analysis maps can be found at

www.fs.fed.us/r5/inyo/projects/route_des/august-09/FEIS_Web_Posting/INF_Travel_Mgnt_FEIS.htm (Note: link also attached to ERDS section).

This grant application dovetails (but does not duplicate) a grant submitted by "Friends of the Inyo" ("Implementation of Travel Management on the Inyo National Forest"), whose crews will play a key role in much of the field work. This project will provide for the barricading and disquising of additional intersections, focused on the remaining portion of the 2300 distinct intersections. The project would utilize hand tools and natural materials -- either imported to site or gathered from close proximity, as analyzed in the 2009 FEIS. The work will be confined to the immediate area of the intersection with legal motorized routes, and will not include intensive restoration and decommissioning of the entire length of the route, which would be conducted if appropriate in the future after additional analysis and public involvement. These treatments will not preclude the use of the routes by other legal non-motorized activities, such as use by equestrians, hikers, or bikers. Placement of signs, logs, rocks, barriers, vertical mulching and other methods will be used to define boundaries of designated motorized routes and disguise entrances to unauthorized routes. This project will be conducted using volunteers, community groups which collaborated in the Travel Management process, as well as Forest Service staff where appropriate.

Key elements that will be funded by this project include planning for final design elements, occasional presence of resource specialists and supervisory personnel of non-agency crews as required. Forest Service crews and patrols will barricade and sign intersections as necessary. Additionally, GPS locating and tracking of each treatment for the purposes of effectiveness monitoring and documenting accomplishments will be critical. Long-term monitoring and tracking of effectiveness, violations, damage, and record of repairs or replacement of treatments will be conducted utilizing a carefully designed GIS database developed just for this purpose.

B. Describe how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation and how OHV Recreation caused the damage:

As disclosed in the 2009 Travel Management Environmental Impact Statement, the Forest has historically managed a motorized system of 1360 miles of roads, of which over 1200 miles are open to all motorized vehicles, including non-highway legal OHVs. Additionally, nearly 1700 miles of unauthorized routes that had either been illegally created by use, or that had existed for many years but had never been analyzed for addition to the system existed on the landscape. As disclosed in the analysis, these motorized routes had varying types and levels of effect on a wide range of resources. Many of these also provided key opportunities for the motorized public. Approximately 700 miles of routes were found to have conflicts with land mangement policy, or detrimental effects or risks from motorized use that outweighed their benefits. The remaining 1000 miles have been added to the transportation system for motorized use.

Blocking and disguising the intersections of the illegal routes will reduce the impacts of motorized use on resources along the routes, and should reduce confusion about which routes are legal. This should improve the experience of OHV users, while ensuring the long-term stability and improvement of resource conditions on the routes with the greatest potential effect from motorized use.

C. Describe the size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles

The overall project area encompasses all non-Wilderness land on the Inyo National Forest, or approximately 1.1 million acres. Since the barricading and disguising of routes will affect roughly 700 miles of unauthorized routes and the assumed direct footprint of most routes is roughly 12 feet, these closure points will affect well over 1,000 acres that will naturally restore over time. Surrounding areas that will have indirect beneficial effects, will exceed 10,000 acres.

D. Monitoring and Methodology

In the 2009 Travel Management Final Environmental Impact Statement (Chapter 2, pg 33), a monitoring strategy is outlined for determining the effectiveness of treatments prescribed in the EIS, including the effectiveness of barricades and disguising of unauthorized routes which will be conducted through this project. Monitoring will be conducted for success of treatments, as well as trend monitoring for distribution of weeds, improvement of habitat for wildlife and botanical resources and effects on cultural resources.

Monitoring will be conducted by OHV personnel on a routine basis and Forest resource specialists as determined by the individual resource monitoring plan. The project will be successful if it meets the following criteria:

• No evidence of new (illegal) OHV use in closed/restored areas

• Restricted areas show signs of improved soil conditions and vegetative recovery

Monitoring will included the following methodologies:

A comprehensive geodatabase has been developed to track the accomplishment and success of Travel Management prescriptions. One module of this database is devoted to these treatments for barricading, disguising and signing unauthorized routes. This database includes GPS data, type of treatment, date and crew accomplishing work, references to pictures at each site, future site visits and other monitoring data. Repeated repairs or the need for new treatments at the same location will be tracked over time, and used in adjusting patrol, enforcement, and future restoration priorities.

Field personnel will document observations (i.e. evidence of motorized vehicle incursions, such as tire tracks, reports from the

public, or actual violation observations). If OHV use is still occuring or restoration areas are not showing signs of improvement,

additional restoration work may be completed incorporating appropriate strategies to eliminate illegal OHV use and

continue to improve resource conditions. These adaptive management strategies will ensure long-term success in these

areas.

Photo point monitoring and observations will be taken to determine if soil and vegetation conditions have improved. Photos will be taken prior to treatment, then upon completion. These photo points and observations would determine if vegetation cover is increasing as a result of project activities. The areas will be routinely patrolled; and signs of incursions, impacts, and any need for repair or additional treatments documented.

E. List of Reports

Planning elements are limited to development of final site-specific design for treatments and/or the need for specialist review or presence during treatments.

The primary tracking and reporting file will be the implementation geodatabase, which will track accomplishments and monitoring history for the project.

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

This project does not involve scientific and cultural studies.

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

These treatments will be patrolled regularly by OHV patrols (Forest Protection Officers) and Law Enforcement Officers, as part of the ongoing monitoring, education, and enforcement efforts. In the past year, the Forest compliment of Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs) has risen from one officer to five LEOs, greatly increasing the field presence and enforcement

needed to educate the public and protect these closed areas. Additionally, volunteers and groups, such as "Friends of the Inyo" and the collaborative community group which has worked with this forest in other Travel Management efforts will assist in ensuring that these treatments are maintained.

Monitoring, as described above would also be implemented to ensure project success. The key strategy will be to repair treatments as soon as possible after damage or incursions.

Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version # _____	APP # 700556

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

North Zone - Treatment Point Distribution
South Zone - Treatment Point Locations
Mid-Forest - Treatment Point Locations
GPS Map Coordinate Discussion - Word Doc

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

Photos - Typical Treatment Points, Intersections
Photos - Buttermilk Scenario - Example
Photos - Resources protected by project
Photos - Typical Treatments

Project Cost Estimate

	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # _____		
APPLICANT NAME :	USFS - Inyo National Forest		
PROJECT TITLE :	Restoration, Travel Management Implementation (FINAL)	**PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :**	G09-02-05-R03
PROJECT TYPE :	☐ Acquisition ☐ Development ☐ Education & Safety ☐ Ground Operations ☐ Law Enforcement ☐ Planning ☑ Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	The Inyo National Forest completed a comprehensive Travel Management Analysis and decision in August of 2009, and is currently initiating a suite of treatments that will implement this decision. The 2009 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) outline an implementation strategy that will assist the public in utilizing the designated system of roads and trails, and avoid confusion about which routes are legal to use. A key element analyzed includes blocking and disguising the intersections/entrances of unauthorized (illegal) routes. This work, as analyzed and authorized in the FEIS/ROD, is described in the FEIS in Chapter 2, pgs 30-34. These pertinent pages are attached to this request, but the complete analysis documents and analysis maps can be found at www.fs.fed.us/r5/inyo/projects/route_des/august-09/FEIS_Web_Posting/INF_Travel_Mgnt_FEIS.htm (Note: link also attached to ERDS section). This grant application dovetails (but does not duplicate) a grant submitted by "Friends of the Inyo" ("Implementation of Travel Management on the Inyo National Forest"), whose crews will play a key role in much of the field work. This project will provide for the barricading and disquising of additional intersections, focused on the remaining portion of the 2300 distinct intersections. The project would utilize hand tools and natural materials -- either imported to site or gathered from close proximity, as analyzed in the 2009 FEIS. The work will be confined to the immediate area of the intersection with legal motorized routes, and will not include intensive restoration and decommissioning of the entire length of the route, which would be conducted if appropriate in the future after additional analysis and public involvement. These treatments will not preclude the use of the routes by other legal non-motorized activities, such as use by equestrians, hikers, or bikers. Placement of signs, logs, rocks, barriers, vertical mulching and other methods will be used to define boundaries of designated motorized routes and disguise entrances to unauthorized routes. This project will be conducted using volunteers, community groups which collaborated in the Travel Management process, as well as Forest Service staff where appropriate. Key elements that will be funded by this project include planning for final design elements, occasional presence of resource specialists and supervisory personnel of non-agency crews as required. Forest Service crews and patrols will barricade and sign intersections as necessary. Additionally, GPS locating and tracking of each treatment for the purposes of effectiveness monitoring and documenting accomplishments will be critical. Long-term monitoring and tracking of effectiveness, violations, damage, and record of repairs or replacement of treatments will be conducted utilizing a carefully designed GIS database developed just for this purpose.		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	**Staff**						

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Other-Project Coordinator Notes : GS-11--Project oversight, coordination with various volunteer groups and implementation crews. Tracking of accomplishments, technical direction for field supervisor and data stewards.	120.000	350.000	DAY	28,000.00	14,000.00	42,000.00
	Other-Restoration Crew Notes : 3 person crew, (100 days/year over 3 year period). Crew may consist of various hiring sources, such as Forest Service hires, Friends of the Inyo, Student Conservation Association (SCA), and/or Youth Conservation Corps (YCC). Individual crewmembers may work with other organizations and manpower crews to direct implementation.	900.000	150.000	DAY	135,000.00	0.00	135,000.00
	Other-Restoration Field Supervisor Notes : Lead field implementation efforts, including project oversight and organization, volunteer coordination, and interactions with Friends of the Inyo. Resource crew supervisor that provides oversight (hiring, training, directing work, quality control, and other logistics) of the crew during implementation.	300.000	310.000	DAY	93,000.00	0.00	93,000.00
	Archeologist Notes : GS-9/11--Field review and cultural resource site monitoring, field clearances on unsurveyed work sites. NZ and SZ archaeologist 25 days each over 3 year period = 50 days total.	50.000	350.000	DAY	8,750.00	8,750.00	17,500.00
	Botanist Notes : GS-9/11--Field review and sensitive plant monitoring (10 days over 3 year period).	10.000	350.000	DAY	3,500.00	0.00	3,500.00
	Other-Volunteers Notes : Individual volunteers and sponsored volunteer groups. Community groups which collaborated in the Travel Management process, OHV user groups (Eastern Sierra 4-wheelers, Sneakers Motorcycle Group), Friends of the Inyo, Range of Light Sierra Club,	375.000	130.000	DAY	0.00	48,750.00	48,750.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	etc. Assumption: Average crew of 5 volunteers for 25 days a year during 3 year period = 375 person days. Will include both implementation and monitoring work. Likely that larger volunteer events will include 20-30 volunteers in single day efforts.						
	Other-OHV Patrols Notes : GS-5/7--Patrol, monitoring, and maintenance of restoration sites (i.e. signage, barriers, public education, enforcement). NZ and SZ OHV patrol 15 days/year over 3 year period (Total 30 days/year over 3 year period = 90 days).	90.000	160.000	DAY	14,400.00	0.00	14,400.00
	Other-Dist. Staff/OHV program mgrs. Notes : GS-11--District OHV Program oversight, including coordination with project manager and with Restoration Crew Supervisor, supervision of OHV patrols. NZ and SZ - 45 days each over 3 year period for a total of 90 days (Total: 30 days/year over a 3 year period).	90.000	300.000	DAY	0.00	27,000.00	27,000.00
	Other-Forest Recreation Officer Notes : GS-13--OHV restoration program oversight as part of Travel Management implementation. Average 5 days/year over 3 year period = 15 days.	15.000	450.000	DAY	0.00	6,750.00	6,750.00
	Other-GIS specialist Notes : GS-7/9--Develop and maintain geodatabase for planning and tracking accomplishments spatially. Provide mapping support and GPS training for planners and field technicians. Upload, truth, and track data received from the field. Create data dictionaries. Average 10 days/year over 3 year period.	30.000	250.000	DAY	5,000.00	2,500.00	7,500.00
	Other-Equipment Operator Notes : WG-7 or 8--Equipment operator to load and haul rock or other materials for hand crews. Estimate 20 days per work season x 3 seasons = 60 days.	60.000	300.000	DAY	18,000.00	0.00	18,000.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Other-Forest Engineer Notes : GS-13 -Provide supervision/direction, support to engineering crews and equipment operators when used as Forest Service field crews. Approx 3 days per year over three year period.	10.000	475.000	DAY	0.00	4,750.00	4,750.00
	Other-Asst Forest Engineer Notes : GS-11/12 -- Provides coordination and management of engineering program and equipment administration, budget agreements, and tracking during three year period.	15.000	350.000	DAY	0.00	5,250.00	5,250.00
	Total for Staff				305,650.00	117,750.00	423,400.00
2	**Contracts**						
3	**Materials / Supplies**						
	Signs Notes : Carsonite signs and stickers.	300.000	30.000	EA	9,000.00	0.00	9,000.00
	Other-Tools Notes : Rakes, shovels, pulaskis, wheel barrows, carsonite sign installer, etc.	1.000	3500.000	EA	1,000.00	2,500.00	3,500.00
	Other-Personal Protective Equipment Notes : Gloves, goggles, hard hats, first aid kits, camping gear, etc.	1.000	3500.000	EA	1,000.00	2,500.00	3,500.00
	Other-GPS units Notes : Purchase of GPS units to identify unauthorized routes on the ground, and document accomplishments in the Forest's database.	2.000	1000.000	EA	1,000.00	1,000.00	2,000.00
	Total for Materials / Supplies				12,000.00	6,000.00	18,000.00
4	**Equipment Use Expenses**						
	Other-Vehicle FOR Notes : Monthly cost for vehicles in support of restoration work. Project Manager Vehicle - 6 months	70.000	325.000	MOS	0.00	22,750.00	22,750.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Field Supervisor Vehicle - 18 months Restoration Crew Vehicles - 30 months OHV Patrol Vehicles - 10 months Flat bed and/or other haul vehicles - 6 months Total = 70 months over 3 year period.						
	Other-Vehicle Mileage Notes : Estimated mileage for restoration project implementation. Project Manager Vehicle - 5,000 miles Field Supervisor Vehicle - 12,000 Restoration Crew Vehicles - 12,000 miles OHV Patrol Vehicles - 6,000 miles Total = 35,000 miles	20000.000	0.400	MI	0.00	8,000.00	8,000.00
	Other-Excavator/Equip Time Notes : Hourly use for fuel and operating/maintenance rate for trail excavator or equipment to load rock or other materials for haul.	300.000	15.000	HRS	0.00	4,500.00	4,500.00
	Total for Equipment Use Expenses				0.00	35,250.00	35,250.00
5	**Equipment Purchases**						
	Other-Power Hauler (Tracked Wheelbarrow) Notes : Purchase one replacement hauler (Tracked Power "wheelbarrow"). Will be used to transport rocks and other heavy borrow materials to work sites from vehicles or from native sources. Powered hauler can typically carry approx half ton of materials. Match is from other Forest funds, assuming that the hauler may be used for work on other motorized projects.	1.000	8000.000	EA	6,000.00	2,000.00	8,000.00
6	**Others**						
	Other-Field Per Diem Notes : Per Diem for camping overnight for the sites that are located in remote locations. Increases crew efficiency by reducing travel time/salary cost. Assumes: $54/person/day. 4 person crew	360.000	54.000	DAY	19,440.00	0.00	19,440.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	x 30 days annually x 3 years = 360 days.						
7	**Indirect Costs**						
	Indirect Costs-Indirect Costs Notes : Administrative costs for OHV Restoration Program and Grant Administration, including program oversight, supervision, budgeting, tracking budget/expenditures, billing, record keeping, etc.	1.000	28000.000	MISC	0.00	28,000.00	28,000.00
Total Program Expenses					343,090.00	189,000.00	532,090.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					343,090.00	189,000.00	532,090.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					**343,090.00**	**189,000.00**	**532,090.00**

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	305,650.00	117,750.00	423,400.00	
2	Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	12,000.00	6,000.00	18,000.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	35,250.00	35,250.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	6,000.00	2,000.00	8,000.00	
6	Others	19,440.00	0.00	19,440.00	
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	28,000.00	28,000.00	
Total Program Expenses		343,090.00	189,000.00	532,090.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		343,090.00	189,000.00	532,090.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		**343,090.00**	**189,000.00**	**532,090.00**	

Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700556

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

ITEM 2

b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a “Project” under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? (Please select Yes or No) ◉ Yes ○ No

d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a “Project” under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ○ No

e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a “Project” under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

The restoration projects are being proposed to reduce confusion about which routes can legally be driven with motorized vehicles and by disguising or blocking illegal routes at intersections with system roads and trails to restore areas where proliferation and expansion of dispersed sites and incursions into closed areas are resulting in impacts to sensitive resources (i.e. water quality, soils, and vegetation). Over the long-term, the restoration projects are expected to reduce impacts and improve watershed condition and habitat for sensitive species.

Project activities include breaking up compacted soils in the immediate roadway, vertical mulching, and placing physical barriers or signs to keep vehicles out of the restoration areas. These activities are designed to reduce sedimentation and erosion, and would result in improvements to water quality and protection of riparian areas, which provide quality habitat for a variety of species. The restoration activities would improve habitat for these species by eliminating use on the routes, reducing route proliferation and incursions into closed areas, reducing impacts to riparian areas, and enhancing vegetation and watershed conditions.

Measures to minimize or eliminate potential effects to watershed, plant, and wildlife resources are incorporated into the project design. Treatment areas with known potential sensitivity have been highlighted during the analysis, and are scheduled to include the presence of specialists before and/or during treatments. The potential effects of these activities were analyzed in the Travel Management FEIS, and were determined to have an overriding beneficial effect, in contrast to leaving the junctions with unauthorized routes untreated. The analysis assumes that failure to clarify which routes are not open to motorized use would result in confusion by visitors, who would intentionally or inadvertently travel the illegal routes with continuing negative effects on wetlands and other natural and cultural resources. Monitoring for similar restoration and conservation projects that have been completed during the last 10 years on the Inyo National Forest have indicated beneficial effects to watershed, plant, and wildlife resources. No adverse effects from implementation of these types of projects have been documented. Restoration activities as proposed under this project would not have adverse effects to wetlands, navigable waters, and sensitive habitats and species, and should benefit these resources. The purpose of the restoration activities are to minimize effects and improve watershed and habitat conditions.

ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

The cumulative impacts from this project are expected to be beneficial. Over the past 10 years, various restoration and conservation efforts have occurred across the Inyo National Forest and in the vicinity of the restoration project areas proposed under this project. Monitoring for similar restoration and conservation projects that have been completed during the last 10 years on the Inyo National Forest have indicated beneficial effects to watershed, plant, and wildlife resources. No adverse effects from implementation of these types of projects have been documented. This project is expected to contribute towards the implementation of a well managed OHV road and trail system and improvement of recreational oppportunities by restoring areas that have been impacted by OHV use, thereby improving the experience of motorized and non-motorized visitors and contributing towards a more sustainable OHV recreation program.

This project, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions of the same type and general place would not result in adverse cumulative effects. In general, these projects are small in scope and scale in their area of direct effect, but provide a substantial long-term beneficial effect on relatively large area, that would no longer be subject to ongoing motorized disturbance. Since these site-specific treatments merely clarify the legally designated system that was determined in the Travel Management FEIS/ROD, these treatments will not contribute to an increase in use, noise, or other cumulative effects on resources resulting from displacement of motorized use.

Cumulative effects of other past, present and foreseeable actions of a similar type are analyzed in the August 2009 FEIS for Travel Management. These can be found in Chapter 3 of the EIS, in each specialist's analysis. The most pertinent references are found in the Cumulative Effects discussion for Water Resources in section 3.7.4.3, Chapter 3, pgs 232-240.

ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

The purpose of this restoration project is to reduce the number and area of unauthorized routes receiving motorized traffic which would otherwise result in bare, compacted soil, with a loss of vegetation, soil stability and soil productivity. Therefore, it is expected that there will be a positive effect on soil productivity and a reduction in soil erosion over the long term. Combined with the direction in the Travel Management EIS, which typically directs motorized traffic to roads and trails that have a higher level of stability, these treatments which will increase the effectiveness of the EIS decision are anticipated to improve soils stability and overall watershed condition. The treatments themselves are expected to have a minor short term effect on soil stability in the immediate area, and long-term moderate beneficial effect on a substantially larger area where soil disturbance from motorized use will cease.

ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

Only a small fraction (approximately .002 or 50 of the 2300 treatment points) of the restoration work would occur within the viewshed of Scenic Byways Highway 395 and State Highway 168. The treatments are of such a small scale as to be unlikely to cause negative short-term or long-term effects on visual resources. In almost all cases, it is likely that these activities would not be visible or noticed from a vehicle on these highways, due to natural screening of trees, and the very minor scale of each treatment. As described in the project description, signs may be placed in areas where this could improve compliance and the effectiveness of treatments. These signs will be placed in as few places as necessary, and will mostly be relatively small, brown carsonite signs that are not visible from long or wide fields of view.

Over the long-term, these restoration projects are expected to improve visual quality by allowing for the gradual restoration of vegetation and naturalization of areas that currently have bare ground, compacted soils, and loss of vegetation. Most treatments will be completed using native materials, and in general are expected to result in improvements to scenic resources. There would be no adverse effects to scenic resources from implementation of this project.

ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

Unauthorized routes were surveyed and analyzed by Cultural Resource specialists during the Travel Management Analysis. Where known sites exist in the project areas, these have been highlighted by these specialists, and if field visits are needed before treatments, these will be conducted. However, the treatments are individually of such a small scale, are conducted by personnel with light handtools, and typically will not involve ground disturbing activities, that adverse effects are not anticipated. During the Travel Management analysis, it was determined that conducting these treatments, which will occur in the currently disturbed area on unauthorized routes, will have low-risk of effects to cultural resources, with a high likelihood of reducing effects to cultural resources from otherwise continued motorized use on the remainder of the unauthorized route.

ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

In general, these projects are small in scope and scale, and are not anticipated to result in substantial displacement of OHV use to other areas. Determinations of legal routes, and the analysis of the potential for displacement of motorized users to other areas was conducted in the Travel Management EIS, and was determined to be minor. Most routes and motorized spurs for camping were receiving incidental use prior to the Travel Management determinations, and in many cases were duplicate routes, providing no additional travel, experiential or recreational benefit. These treatments, which implement the Travel Management plan, will not in themselves have an increased effect in displacing users to other areas. At the end of roads and at treatment points along system roads which could provide dispersed camping opportunities, turnaround points, or parking areas, the restoration work would maintain appropriate space for these activities. Most of the restoration work in the vicinity of dispersed campsites, staging areas, and at the end of parking spurs will be containment of the sites, to prevent expansion of compacted areas and sites into sensitive areas.

Past experience from implementation of similar restoration projects in other areas on the Inyo National Forest and in the

vicinity of these proposed restoration areas have not resulted in a significant displacement of OHV use to other areas. The majority of the unauthorized routes on which these treatments are occuring were commonly low-use spurs, deadends, or duplicate routes, and the amount of use from these low-use areas is expected to be easily absorbed by the remaining 2370 miles of higher use and higher capacity roads and trails on the Forest. While the treatment sites are dispersed over a large land base (approximately 1.1 million acres of land), the actual project work is small in scope and scale, and is not expected to result in noticeable displacement of OHV use to other areas or result in adverse direct or indirect effects.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Attachments:

Inyo NF Travel Management FEIS/ROD Link

Implementation Excerpt from INF Trav Mgmt FEIS/ROD

Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700556

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

- ○ 76% or more (10 points)
- ○ 51% - 75% (5 points)
- ◉ 26% - 50% (3 points)
- ○ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 22

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☑ Domestic water supply (4 points)
- ☐ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
- ☑ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
- ☑ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
- ☑ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [3]
- ☑ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species [2]
- ☑ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species [3]

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

This project, if funded will place barricades and disguise the majority of the 2300 intersections of routes closed in the Travel Management planning process for exactly the reasons listed above. Preventing use of the routes will improve conditions in Owens River watersheds, including Mammoth Creek, a 303d water body and domestic water sources for Southern California. Preventing use of the routes will reduce active soil erosion and sediment in hundreds of streams Forestwide. Closures will reduce incursions into Wilderness, wetlands, riparian habitat and Roadless Areas. T&E listed species affected include Lahontan Cutthroat Trout, Piute Cutthroat Trout. Other special status species include northern goshawk, greater sage grouse, American marten, the Mono milkvetch, Mono Lake lupin, and Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
- ◉ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
- ○ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
- ○ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
- ○ Management decision (1 point)
- ○ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)

○ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

Travel Management Record of Decision (ROD,2009); Inyo National Forest LRMP (1988), as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment ROD.

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 10

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- ☑ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- ☑ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- ☑ Use of native plants and materials
- ☑ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- ☐ Educational signage
- ☑ Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

Monitoring for implementation success is prescribed and required by the Travel Management decision of 2009, and is described in the project description. The entire project is designed around placing barriers and disguising to reduce incursions into areas closed to motor vehicle use. Most treatments will be conducted using native on-site materials, though some native materials may be imported from off-site. A forest watershed specialist has already been involved in the prescriptions to ensure that Best Mgmt Practices are followed, and will be present during certain points in the project to help with final field design where appropriate. The Forest's Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) and other higher quality recreation maps are being developed to ensure the public is aware of the legal and stable road and trail system that can be used to avoid these more sensitive, closed sites. Signage of open routes is also in progress.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

○ No (No points) ◉ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

Inyo National Forest Travel Management Record of Decision (ROD, 2009); Inyo National Forest LRMP (1988), as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (2004), 2009 Wilderness Bill.

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ◉ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
- ○ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
- ○ Other Grant funding (2 points)
- ○ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

It is anticipated that the Forest's operational budget would be the primary funding source utilized to support future operational costs associated with this project, although other types of funding listed above may also be utilized where feasible, appropriate, and necessary to supplement the Forest's operational budget. The Forest has been actively utilizing Legacy Roads and Trails and Watershed funding to support these types of restoration projects (Region 5 budget direction for FY10, updated 2/2010). Volunteer help will also be used extensively, which will greatly improve efficiency -- especially with help from the Collaborative Travel Management group.

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
- [ ] Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
- [x] Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

Extensive public involvement through multiple public and stakeholder meetings was an integral part of the Inyo National Forest Travel Management Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decsion. A collaborative community group was highly involved in the process, and has made many recommendations about the restoration activities described herein.

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- (•) 4 or more (4 points)
- ( ) 2 to 3 (2 points)
- ( ) 1 (1 point)
- ( ) None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Local access groups such as Eastern Sierra 4-Wheelers, Sneakers Motorcycle Club, and other local community groups such as Friends of the Inyo, Range of Light Sierra Club group, and importantly the Collaborative Alternative Team (now calling itself the Collaborative Action Team) that consists of local interested public, Student Conservation Association may be used as well.

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will 1

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- [ ] Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
- [ ] Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
- [x] Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
- [ ] Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

This project has a monitoring component, but is not specifically intended to produce scientific or cultural studies. Monitoring would focus on "lessons learned" and the overall effectiveness of this project. Adaptive management through adjustments to restoration techniques would be employed after assessing results..

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ No (No points)
- ◉ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

The Travel Managment Record of Decision (2009) resulted in the designation of a sustainable system of roads and trails that provide OHV opportunities while minimizing impacts to natural and cultural resources. The routes that are proposed for barriering and closure were not designated as part of the National Forest System, and are unauthorized for OHV use. Unmanaged OHV recreation will not continue on these routes.

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ◉ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)
- ○ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)
- ○ Less than 1 acre (1 points)
- ○ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)